1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Stephen M. Doniger (SBN 179314) stephen@donigerlawfirm.com Scott Alan Burroughs (SBN 235718) scott@donigerlawfirm.com Trevor W. Barrett (SBN 287174) tbarrett@donigerlawfirm.com Justin M. Gomes (SBN 301793) jgomes@donigerlawfirm.com DONIGER / BURROUGHS 603 Rose Avenue Venice, California 90291 Telephone: (310) 590-1820			
8 9	Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant PETER MENZEL			
10	UNITED STATES I	DISTRICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
12	FREE SPEECH SYSTEMS, LLC, a Texas limited liability company,	Case No. 19-cv-00711-WHO		
13	Plaintiff,	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT		
14 15 16 17 18	v. PETER MENZEL, an individual, Defendant.	Date: June 12, 2019 Time: 2:00 P.M. Courtroom: 2 Judge: Honorable William H. Orrick Complaint filed: February 8, 2019		
19	PETER MENZEL, an individual,	Trial Date: None Set		
20	Counterclaimant,			
21	V.			
22	FREE SPEECH SYSTEMS, LLC, individually and doing business as "InfoWars.com a Texas			
23	limited liability company; and DOES 1-10,			
24	Counterdefendants.			
25 26		1		
27				
28	1	l		

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-9 and the Court's April 8, 2019 Case Management Conference Order (Dkt. No. 19), the parties submit this Joint Case Management Statement.

1. <u>Jurisdiction and Service</u>: This court has federal subject matter jurisdiction over the claims concerning copyright infringement and violation of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act. No issues exist regarding the Court's personal jurisdiction over the parties or venue. All parties have been served.

2. Facts: Plaintiff-Counterdefendant Free Speech Systems, LLC, individually and doing business as "InfoWars.com" (collectively "FSS"), a new media company, posted an article on its website featuring seven (7) photographs which Defendant-Counterclaimant Peter Menzel ("Menzel"), a professional photographer, claims he owns, registered with the United States Copyright Office, and did not authorize FSS to exploit. Menzel further alleges that FSS, or its source for the allegedly infringed photographs, removed certain of Menzel's copyright management information from those photographs and that FSS distributed those photographs knowing that such information had been removed. FSS disputes Menzel's claims, and filed a declaratory relief action seeking a

3. <u>Legal Issues</u>: This case concerns whether FSS's accused actions constitute copyright infringement under the Copyright Act (17 U.S.C. §101 et seq.) or violation of §1202 of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act ("DMCA"). Legal issues concerning fair use, direct and secondary liability for copyright infringement, the statute of limitations, and damages are all present.

judgment stating that its accused actions did not violate any aspect of the Copyright Act.

4. <u>Motions</u>: FSS filed a motion to dismiss Menzel's amended counterclaims, and to strike several of Menzel's affirmative defenses. Both motions have been briefed, are currently pending, and are slated for oral argument on June 12, 2019. Provided that this case proceeds beyond the pleadings stage, Menzel anticipates filing a motion for summary adjudication as to copyright infringement and

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6

violation of §1202 of the DMCA. FSS anticipates filing a motion for summary adjudication as to these claims as well.

5. Amendment of Pleadings: If the Court grants any part of FSS's motion to dismiss with leave to amend, Menzel will amend his counterclaims. The parties propose August 9, 2019 as the deadline to amend pleadings.

Evidence Preservation: The parties have reviewed the Guidelines Relating to the Discovery of Electronically Stored Information ("ESI Guidelines"), and have met and conferred pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) regarding reasonable and proportionate steps taken to preserve evidence relevant to the issues reasonably evident in this action, referencing ESI Guidelines 2.01 and 2.02 and Checklist for ESI Meet and Confer.

7. Disclosures: The parties will exchange Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 initial disclosures on or before June 10, 2019.

8. Discovery: The parties anticipate using all discovery allowed under the Federal Rules, including depositions, requests for documents, interrogatories and requests for admissions, and entering into an appropriate stipulated protective order. The parties further anticipate an initial round of written discovery comprised of Interrogatories, Requests for Production of documents, and Requests for Admission to be propounded by the end of August 2019. Follow-up written discovery and conferring over and otherwise resolving any discovery disputes should be completed by the end of January 2020. The parties also anticipate that each party, as well as third parties, will need to be deposed, and that said depositions shall take place after an initial round of written discovery. The parties anticipate these depositions being taken between November through December 2019. See the below proposed schedule of dates for all proposed discovery deadlines.

27

28

1	
2	9. <u>Class Actions:</u> This matter is not a class action suit.
3	
4	10. Related Cases: There are no related cases pending before this or any other court or
5	administrative body.
6	
7	11. Relief: FSS seeks declaratory relief absolving it of any potential liability for the claims of
8	copyright infringement and DMCA violations that Menzel has asserted. FSS also seeks to recover its
9	costs and fees incurred in this action. Menzel seeks either actual damages in the form of FSS's
10	disgorgeable profits and Menzel's lost profits due to FSS's copyright infringement, or statutory
11	damages of up to \$150,000.00 per allegedly infringed work. Menzel also seeks statutory damages of
12	up to \$25,000.00 for every FSS violation of the DMCA concerning its exploitation of the allegedly
13	infringed photographs. Menzel also seeks to recover his costs and fees incurred in this action.
14	
15	12. <u>Settlement and ADR:</u> The parties have discussed potential resolution of this matter both
16	before and after this action was filed. While some progress has been made, a considerable gap remains
17	between the parties' respective settlement positions. The parties have agreed to proceed with an Early
18	Neutral Evaluation under the Local Rules but have not yet been able to determine a mutually
19	agreeable date on which that session might take place.
20	
21	13. Consent to Magistrate Judge for All Purposes: The parties do not consent to have a magistrate
22	judge conduct all further proceedings including trial and entry of judgment.
23	
24	14. Other References: The parties do not believe the case is suitable for reference to binding
25	arbitration, a special master, or the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.
26	
27	
28	4

15. Narrowing of Issues: The parties have not yet agreed to mechanisms for the narrowing of issues but intend to discuss doing so as the case progresses, potentially with the assistance of the mediator in the event the entire case does not settle at that time.

16. Expedited Trial Procedure: The parties do not believe that this case is suitable for the Expedited Trial Procedure of General Order No. 64 Attachment A.

17. <u>Scheduling</u>: The parties propose the following dates.

Event	Ising Duan agal		
Event	Joint Proposal		
Early Neutral Evaluation Deadline	September 30, 2019		
Close of fact discovery	February 21, 2020		
Opening expert reports	February 28, 2020		
Rebuttal expert reports	March 20, 2020		
Close of expert discovery	April 10, 2020		
Summary judgment opening briefs	May 6, 2020		
Summary judgment oppositions	May 27, 2020		
Summary judgment replies	June 17, 2020		
Summary judgment hearing	July 8, 2020, or per Court Order		
Pretrial Conference	September 9, 2020		
Trial	September 29, 2020		

18. <u>Trial</u>: The case will be tried to a jury. The expected length is 3-4 days.

1	19. <u>Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons</u> : Each party has filed a "Certification						
2	of Interested Entities or Persons" as required by Civil Local Rule 3-15, and restates here the content						
3	of the certification.						
4	20. <u>Professional Conduct</u> : All attorneys of record for the parties have reviewed the Guidelines						
5	for Professional Conduct for the Northern District of California.						
6							
7	Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), the filer of this document attests that all signatories have						
8	concurred in its filing.						
9							
10			Respectfully submitted,				
11	Dated: June 4, 2019 By	y:	/s/ Alex J. Shepard				
12			Marc J. Randazza (CA SBN 269535) Alex J. Shepard (CA SBN 295058)				
13			RANDAZZA LEGAL GROUP, PLLC				
14			2764 Lake Sahara Drive, Suite 109 Las Vegas, NV 89117				
15			Telephone: 702-420-2001 Fax: 305-437-7662				
16			ecf@randazza.com Attorney for Plaintiff				
17			Free Speech Systems LLC				
18	Dated: June 4, 2019 By	y:	/s/ Justin M. Gomes				
19			Scott Alan Burroughs, Esq. Justin M. Gomes, Esq.				
20			DONIGER / BURROUGHS 603 Rose Avenue				
21			Venice, CA 90291				
22			(310) 590-1820 scott@donigerlawfirm.com				
23			Attorneys for Defendant Peter Menzel				
24			Tetel Menzel				
25	Pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), the filer attests that all other signatories listed, and on						
26	whose behalf this filing is submitted, concur in the filing's content and have authorized the filing.						
27							
28			6				